

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed January 12, 2005 has been carefully considered by applicant. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing claim amendments and the remarks that follow.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Claims 7 and 9-11 are indicated as allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 USC §112, second paragraph. However, the Office Action fails to set forth any rejections under 35 USC §112. The Examiner's reference to §112, second paragraph is believed to be in error, however the indication of allowance of claims 7 and 9-11 is believed accurate. By the present Amendment, claim 7 and 9-11 are retained in dependent form and independent claim 1 is amended to further distinguish over the prior art. Claims 7 and 9-11 are thus believed allowable in dependent form.

CLAIMS/REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §102

Claims 1-6 and 8 have been rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Quigley U.S. Patent No. 6,575,279. Claim 1 has been amended and independent claim 12 added to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention and render the same allowable over the applied reference.

Claim 1 now recites that the first and second ratchet members are formed from materials having different specifications such that likelihood of failure of both ratchet members is minimized. Quigley '279 fails to teach or suggest the claimed first and second ratchet members formed from materials having different specifications such that likelihood of failure of both ratchet members is minimized. Quigley '279 is also completely silent with regard to the problem faced by the present application and the solution, as now clearly recited in amended claim 1.

Claims 2-11 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 and are thus believed allowable for the reasons stated above, as well as the subject matter recited therein.

Claim 8 has been amended to state that the first ratchet member is angularly offset from the second ratchet member in the direction of rotation such that only one of the

ratchet members is initially engageable by the pawl member. This arrangement is also not taught or suggested by Quigley '279.

Claim 12 has been added to state that the first and second ratchet members are formed from the same materials that have been treated by different treatment methods to enhance their durability and reduce the likelihood of failure of both ratchet members. This aspect is also neither taught nor suggested by Quigley '279 which, as stated above, is completely silent with regard to the problem faced by the present application and the solution to that problem, as now clearly recited in claim 12.

Claims 13-21 depend directly or indirectly from claim 12 and are thus believed allowable for the reasons stated above, as well as the subject matter recited therein.

CONCLUSION

The present application is thus believed in condition for allowance with claims 1-21. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

ANDRUS, SCEALES, STARKE & SAWALL, LLP



Peter T. Holsen
Reg. No. 54,180

Andrus, Sceales, Starke & Sawall, LLP
100 East Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 1100
Milwaukee, WI 53202
(414) 271-7590
Attorney Docket No.: 248-00283